

MEETING MINUTES FROM THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

August 6, 2014

Maricopa Association of Governments Office, Ironwood Room
302 North First Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona

AGENCY MEMBERS

- | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Jim Badowich, Avondale, Vice Chair | |
| Craig Sharp, Buckeye | |
| Warren White, Chandler | |
| Antonio Hernandez, El Mirage | |
| * Wayne Costa, Florence | |
| Tom Condit, Gilbert | |
| * Mark Ivanich, Glendale | |
| * Tom Vassalo, Goodyear | |
| Bob Herz, MCDOT | |
| | * Julie Christoph, Mesa |
| | Dan Nissen, Peoria |
| | Syd Anderson, Phoenix (St. Trans.) |
| | Jami Erickson, Phoenix (Water) |
| | Rod Ramos, Scottsdale |
| | Dan Shaffer, Surprise |
| | * Tom Wilhite, Tempe, Chair |
| | Harvey Estrada, Valley Metro |
| | Gregory Arrington, Youngtown |

ADVISORY MEMBERS

- | | |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| Jeff Benedict, ARPA | |
| * Arvid Veidmark, AZUCA | |
| Mike Sanders, AZUCA | |
| * Adrian Green, AGC | |
| Brian Gallimore, AGC | |
| | Jeff Hearne, ARPA |
| | Peter Kandarlis, Independent |
| | Paul R. Nebeker, Independent |
| | * Jacob Rodriguez, SRP |

MAG ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Gordon Tyus

- * Members not attending or represented by proxy.

GUESTS/VISITORS

Stew Waller, Rinker
Mike S. Molina, Oldcastle Precast

1. Call to Order

Vice Chair Jim Badowich called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m.

2. Call to the Audience

Vice Chair Badowich opened the call to the audience. No members of the audience requested to speak.

3. Approval of Minutes

The members reviewed the July 9, 2014 meeting minutes. Warren White noted that it should show that he was not present at the last meeting. He then moved to accept the minutes with this correction. Dan Nissen seconded the motion. A voice vote of all ayes and no nays was recorded.

Carry Forward 2013 Cases

4. Case 13-15: Revisions to MAG Sections 101, 601, 603, 615 and 618 for Rigid and Flexible Pipe. Updates to Details 200-1 and 200-2.

Update pipe installation requirements. Warren White said complete final and redlined versions of the case were included in the agenda packet. A one-page addendum was passed out during the meeting that changed the maximum lift depth from 4' to 2' in the final backfill sections 601.4.5 and 603.4.5. Bob Herz recommended an 8" maximum lift prior to compaction in keeping with requirements of section 211 Fill Construction, and he believed Phoenix had a maximum of 12". Jeff Hearne said the language also requires that the lift thickness can't be more than whatever can be effectively compacted. Mr. Herz said the county currently requires CLSM and was okay with the 2' change since it will not affect them.

Jim Badowich said that the update does leave jetting in as an option, but with more restrictions. Warren White said this method is only allowed in the pipe zone area. No jetting is allowed for final backfill. Mr. Badowich said flooding is not allowed. He added that CLSM is an option in the table for allowable backfills – this includes options to just the spring line if preferred. Mr. White added that detail 200 shows the backfill options. Mr. Kandaris asked if the 2' lift requirement was included in Section 603. Mr. White noted that the addendum includes the change to Section 603 as well. Jim Badowich thanked Warren White and industry representatives for their work on this case and said they planned to vote on the case at the next meeting.

5. Case 13-21: Create a new Section 742 Pre Cast Manholes. Add detail drawings for construction and installation. Update existing manhole details.

Update specifications and details for pre-cast manhole bases and other corrections. Craig Sharp said he received comments from the county and discussed them with Bob Herz. A handout provided summarized the comments received. Mr. Sharp went through the comments

to get feedback from other committee members. The first was to change the wording in Section 742.1 to make it applicable for all manholes.

Mr. Sharp said he agreed to reorder the ASTM references in Section 742.2.3. Bob Herz agreed to leave Section 742.3 MANHOLE PENETRATIONS as is. Paul Nebeker asked about the requirement for the coating to be applied by the manufacturer. Craig Sharp said that the modifications discussed in the section are done at the plant, and the coating is also applied at this time. This was also shown in the details. Peter Kandaris questioned the water tightness requirement for dry utilities. After discussion, the committee decided to leave this in since most manholes the cities specify are for sewer and storm drain where water-tightness is required, and utilities such as SRP already have their own details for dry utilities.

Craig Sharp agreed to accept the changes to Section 742.4 REINFORCING, and to add “type” for the reference in Section 742.5 to 316 stainless steel. Dan Shafer pointed out a grammar error where “of” and “for” were next to each other. Mr. Sharp agreed to make the changes to the specification as discussed.

The committee then began discussing the detail drawings. First there were questions about the adjustment rings including the size and process of installing them. Mr. Sharp said that typically larger rings are on the bottom, with smaller rings on top. Bob Herz suggested clarifying the notes and dimensions for the adjustment rings. Rod Ramos said the note conflated two issues, and could be broken up to show the dimension (and note) for the rings on one side, and the overall dimension to the top of grade on the other. This issue also needed to be corrected on the flattop option and on Detail 421.

On Detail 422 MANHOLE FRAME AND COVER ADJUSTMENT, Bob Herz suggested showing a larger radius on the concrete collar so that it would be less likely to be disturbed by graders. Rod Ramos said Scottsdale’s detail shows the edge tapered instead of rounded and could supply their detail for an example. He also suggested changing the note referencing the reinforcing steel to state, “If required by agency...” Members also discussed if the size of the adjustment rings should be noted on the detail.

Jim Badowich asked where the cast-in-place base was shown. Mr. Sharp said it still was shown on Detail 420-1 and included notes about the base in #2 and #3. There was also discussion about Detail 420-3. Members believed the drawing should show a 12” straight section before there are any bends or change in radius. It was also suggested to remove the note “CHANNEL FORMED WITH PRECAST BASE” since the drawing could be applicable for cast-in-place bases as well. The word “PRECAST” could also be deleted from the title.

Mr. Sharp said he would work with Bob Herz after the meeting to make the changes to the details as discussed, and then prepare a final version to be voted on at the next meeting.

6. Case 13-22: Update Sections 625 and 775 to remove references to the use of bricks in manholes and remove references to manhole steps.

Craig Sharp said comments on Sections 625 and 775 were provided by Bob Herz prior to the meeting. He began discussing the comments that were provided on a handout. Mr. Sharp said he would accept the changes to the title and description to make the specification more generally applicable. Bob Herz suggested adding back in language for manhole steps with the correct ASTM specifications since Scottsdale has a detail that references them. Antonio Hernandez said they want to get rid of steps for safety reasons. Most members agreed. It was suggested that Scottsdale update their supplemental detail rather than MAG including specs for it. It was also recommended to delete the step detail 428. Mr. Herz suggested removing the reference to smooth mortared surfaces in section 625.3.1 since concrete did not require a mortared surface and the invert channels were already required to be smooth in the paragraph above it.

Jim Badowich suggested that Craig Sharp and Bob Herz get together after the meeting to work on the changes needed. He could then prepare a new cover sheet summarizing the changes and have a final version ready for a vote at the next meeting.

New Cases for 2014

7. Case 14-01: Miscellaneous Corrections.

One new correction case (D) was introduced.

A. Change "transverse" to "longitudinal" in Section 321.8.2.

B. In section 739.1, delete the extra occurrence of the word 'Pipe'.

C. Delete "OR BRICK" from the title of Section 342.

D. Change "forecast" to "for cast" in Section 750.3 JOINT REQUIREMENTS.

Jami Erickson said this update should be included in the packet. Paul Nebeker noticed that it still referenced rubber gaskets, and suggested they be changed to elastometric. Ms. Erickson said that was beyond the scope of a corrections case, and suggested making a new case to take care of all rubber gasket references next year. Bob Herz requested a vote on Case 14-01 at the next meeting.

8. Case 14-03: Updates to Guardrail Details.

Make revisions to Section 415 and/or include guardrail details in MAG. Bob Herz said the county will still have the existing details in their supplement. MCDOT plans to add new Midwest Guardrail System details to the County's supplement when ready, and said this case can carry over to 2015.

9. Case 14-05: Revisions to Section 324 Portland Cement Concrete Pavement (PCCP).

Use compressive rather than tensile strength tests, modernize and reorganize section as needed. Jeff Hearne said there have been no additional changes and he believed the case was

ready for a vote. Bob Herz moved to accept the case as presented. Syd Anderson seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and the case was approved: 12 yes, 0 no, 0 abstaining and 5 not present.

10. Case 14-06: Revisions to Section 718 Preservative Seal for Asphalt Concrete.

Update the specifications for the Type C preservative seal. Jeff Benedict said this case will be carried forward until next year, and was planned to be discussed at the next Asphalt Working Group meeting scheduled for August 21st at noon.

11. Case 14-10: Include Language to Allow Use of Warm Mix Asphalt.

Update Sections 321 and 710. Jeff Benedict said he received and incorporated comments from Maricopa County in a final version that was handed out at the meeting. He noted the changes were shown in yellow in Section 710.3.1 (11). Bob Herz said the last yellow paragraph should be shown as a bullet like the previous one. Mr. Herz asked if any member felt they needed to bring it back for review. Seeing none he moved to accept the case with the changes discussed and shown in the revised Section 710 as well as the revisions shown in Section 321 that was in the packet. Syd Anderson seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and the case was approved: 12 yes, 0 no, 0 abstaining and 5 not present.

12. Case 14-11: Delete the use of Asbestos-Cement Pipe in Valve Box Installations.

Replace ACP with PVC C900 pipe in Detail 391-2 and make associated drawing changes to Details 391-1 and 392. Also update Section 610.7. Since Bob Herz was not in attendance at the last meeting, he asked for clarification for the changes suggested in the meeting minutes. For Detail 391-1 it was discussed that the base was precast and the pipe fits straight into it. Paul Nebeker had a question about the frame and cover clearance and suggested showing the dimensions. For Detail 391-2 members noted that you only need the option of the 8" pipe. Mr. Herz said he found where Phoenix used a 12" version. Jami Erickson confirmed that Phoenix got rid of the 12" size and that 8" was fine. Mr. Herz asked for a vote at the next meeting.

13. Case 14-12: Proposed Revisions to Sections 336.3 and 336.4.

Add pavement removal criteria to prevent full depth pavement cuts from being located within a lane wheel path and to prevent creation of narrow pavement edge strips. Bob Herz asked for comments. Jeff Benedict said most of the comments originated in the Asphalt Working Group. They felt there was a problem with the wording not being clear. Jim Badowich said they have been having similar discussions about this issue in Avondale between their engineers and CIP personnel. He believed that it was more of a design issue, and that it would be difficult for contractors in the field to determine where the wheel paths would be. He also thought that this change would require more material replacement and higher costs. Bob Herz said the wheel paths are based on the striping plan. Rod Ramos also thought it was more of a design or permitting issue, and wondered how milling operations would be effected. Mr. Herz said the case was dealing with full depth cuts. He said he could drop it as a case in MAG, but that MCDOT will still have it as a supplement. Jeff Benedict said there would be more discussion

on the case at the working group meeting. Mr. Herz suggested that the case be carried forward to next year.

14. Case 14-13: Revisions to Section 321. Incorporate MCDOT Supplements.

Incorporate MCDOT enhancements to Section 321 PLACEMENT AND CONSTRUCTION OF ASPHALT CONCRETE PAVEMENT into the MAG Specifications. Mr. Herz asked for comments. Jeff Benedict said it was discussed at the last working group meeting and that they were okay with everything except for an issue in the acceptance section 321.10.3. Bob Herz said there are issues with the existing acceptance requirements for pavement thickness. Peter Kandaris said there was the problem of the wheel path location as discussed in the previous case. Jim Badowich wanted to know what was meant by “acceptable conditions” for the curb and gutters and wanted to know if a problem would require a change order. He was also not clear on whether this was for new curb and gutter or any existing material. Mr. Herz explained that it was for new curb and gutter only and would try to clarify the language. Rod Ramos was still concerned that a contractor may have to delay his work based on scheduling issues caused by another contractor. Brian Gallimore wanted to know if contractors could get permission to go ahead with their work. Mr. Herz said he would make the final revisions and wants to vote on the case at next month’s meeting.

15. Case 14-14: Consolidate all testing requirements in a new Section 611.

Create a new Section 611 and update existing specifications to delete testing specs and refer to the appropriate information in new Section 611. Jami Erickson handed out a revised version of the case that incorporated comments from Maricopa County. Some sections were moved from 610 to 611 while others were moved from 611 to 610 based on if they were related to testing procedures. The numbering was also adjusted accordingly. Jami Erickson said she will make final corrections and prepare the case for a vote next month. Jim Badowich reminded members to consider that this case was mainly to reorganize the testing into one place and that future changes to the text, additional testing options, and so on, would be considered in future cases.

16. Case 14-15: Updates and revisions to Section 610.

Move Hydrostatic Testing from Section 610 to Section 611, update Table 610-1 to be consistent with AWWA, place Section 610 into sequential order. Jim Badowich provided an updated version of Section 610 based on feedback and comments from Maricopa County. He went on to summarize the changes. The items in red were new changes or additions. Item in green were not changed, but moved around in the spec to make the process better ordered sequentially. The testing sections were moved into the new Section 611. Section 610.3 added the option for cast iron pipe. Section 610.4 was broken into subparagraphs with headings. Section 610.4.4 (pipe cleaning) was moved from 611. The testing subsection now refers to the tests in Section 611. Another change to Section 610 was updating Table 610-1 for the polywrap sizes to match the current AWWA table. Finally, Mr. Badowich said that references to “bid” were changed to “contract price” at the request of Bob Herz, and sections were renumbered as needed.

There was some discussion about the paragraph that begins “A contingent item for fittings not shown on the plans...” in Section 610.16 regarding “Payment will be made at the unit bid per pound on the theoretical weight of the fittings installed.” Members agreed to delete this paragraph since it was confusing and not needed, and then renumber the paragraphs afterwards as #3 and #4. Mr. Badowich asked members to provide any final comments so that he could prepare the final version of the case to be voted on at the next meeting.

17. Case 14-16: Revision to Section 310 - Placement of Construction of Aggregate Base Course.

Change rock correction method to be consistent with Section 301. Brian Gallimore said he has not received any comments on the case to change the rock correction method in 310.3 to ARIZ-227C to be consistent with Section 301. He called for a vote at the next meeting.

18. Case 14-17: Create New Section 322 - Asphalt Stamping.

Provide specifications for materials and methods of Asphalt Stamping. Brian Gallimore said the case is based on the asphalt stamping supplement from Gilbert. He said he recently took photos and video of the process for a job in Peoria. Warren White said that people in Chandler’s street department wanted some kind of a warranty period. Rod Ramos questioned whether the text on being prequalified was necessary, since such prequalification was not required in other areas. Mr. Gallimore said he wanted to make sure the contractor was able to do the job correctly. He said this process was typically used for crosswalks and in private developments. Rod Ramos said stamping is used often in Scottsdale, and would try to find their specifications for comparison. Other comments included concerns about the age of the pavement to be stamped and the potential for oil to streak onto the painted surface on newly paved roads. Mr. Gallimore said this case would be reviewed again at the next working group meeting and would like to vote on it at the next meeting.

19. Case 14-18: Revise Terminology in Section 340.

Change all occurrences of the term “sidewalk ramp” in section 340 to “curb ramp” to prevent confusion. Bob Herz said this case uses terminology to match that used by ADA. Jim Badowich had a question about the payment calculation for curb through an apron. Mr. Herz said MAG currently measures the curb through aprons, driveways, etc. Rod Ramos said Scottsdale requires thicker concrete in those areas. Several members commented that the driveways and ramps are bid on unit price for the whole thing including the aprons for example. Rod Ramos thinks that how the price of the curb is calculated should be changed based on the changes to how the individual items are bid, and that you shouldn’t have to pay for curb, where there isn’t any. He thinks there should be separate pay items for all components including the actual curb and sidewalk built.

Since there was agreement on the first revision to change “sidewalk ramp” to “curb ramp”, but no consensus on how to determine the payment for increased curb depth, Mr. Herz said he would adjust the case to include item 1 of the case, but delete the changes proposed in item 2 to modify Section 340.5. He said he would prepare the changes and asked to vote on the case at the next meeting.

20. Case 14-19: Revisions to Section 325 and 717.

Add provisions for terminal-blended asphalt-rubber binder (ARB). Brian Gallimore handed out a revised version of the case at the meeting. He said he received some comments and asked for more. He said the case was necessary because terminal-blended rubber is being used, but the testing requirements are not correct. Section 325 addresses binder content at the plant, but there is no way to test the final product in the field. He said he expected additional comments from the county. Mr. Ramos said Scottsdale wants it tested and the air voids test is not right. Mr. Gallimore asked members to take it back and review it. The case will be discussed at the Asphalt Working Group meeting on the 21st. He said industry members will be present and asked agency members to attend so they can work out a final version. He hoped it could be ready for next month, but thought that it was important enough to have a meeting in October to get it through if it was not ready by next month.

21. Working Group Reports

Mr. Badowich began reports from the working group chairs.

a. **Water/Sewer Issues Working Group**

Mr. Badowich said he missed the meeting due to a conflict; however, the group did meet and review the current cases. (The notes from the meeting were in the agenda packet.) In order for Mr. Badowich and Mr. Herz to attend the next meeting, it was decided to reschedule it for next Thursday, August 14, at 1:30 p.m. in the MAG office.

b. **Asphalt/Materials Working Groups**

Jeff Benedict said their next meeting is scheduled for August 21st at noon at the ARPA offices.

c. **Concrete Working Group**

Jeff Hearne said they are done meeting for the year.

d. **Outside Right-of-Way Working Group**

Peter Kandaris said he has nothing to report at this time.

22. General Discussion

ADA Requirements. Warren White said Chandler's consultant, Cole, says they expect the latest ADA requirements (PROWAG) will likely to go into effect in October of this year. He said Rule 207.2 of the ADA requirements will only allow a diagonal ramp in certain alteration situations, and Rule 304.1 intentionally does not include the diagonal ramp for new construction and that future accessible ramps will need to be directional. Bob Herz agreed that MAG needs to add dual directional ramps to the set of details. Dan Nissen of Peoria said they have worked on details and wondered if any working group is currently working on the issue. In the past the Concrete Working Group reviewed them, but not currently. Mr. Herz said the county is aware of the changed requirement and had started to develop dual ramp details.

23. Adjournment:

Seeing no further business the meeting was adjourned at 4:32 p.m.